

From: OperaMom15 <OperaMom15@aol.com>  
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
Date: 12/26/97 10:50am  
Subject: Pay Phone Ruling.....

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

It is with much dismay that I once again find the heavy lobbying arm of the phone company has again pummeled the FCC into submission. I object strenuously to the new pay-phone fees which have been implemented specifically against pager users who depend on them to access messages and who don't want to pay outrageous calling card rates simply to access their voice mail.

I encourage you at the FCC to take a stand against this policy and return the rates to their original state.

Thank you,

Paul S. Castellani a VOTING member of the community....

RECEIVED

DEC 29 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

2

From: TLPumpkin <TLPumpkin@aol.com>  
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
Date: 12/26/97 8:45pm  
Subject: pay telephone reclassification

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

I just recieved my phone bill from my calling card carrier, econophone, and was most surprised to find a sudden new tax imposed on my pay telephone use. There was no advance warning that I might have curtailed my use on pay telephones and no explanation of the new tax and the reasons behind it.

Let me state to you that I travel around the country for a living, and in this I am not alone. I rely on pay phones to collect my voice mail messages at any time during the day and return the calls that have come in. I can conduct business without them. However, often the calls themselves cost less than \$.20 and now to impose a \$.35 tax on that, that's a 75% tax, which is simply absurd and a huge infringement upon my business costs. I would like an explanation of this tax and a list if one is available of calling cards companies that are not subject to the tax or tghat have placed a formal complaint against it. It is a gross injustice. A public phone is there for public use and. What will you tax next, the toilet paper in public restrooms?

Tara-Lynn Wagner

RECEIVED

DEC 29 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List A B C D E \_\_\_\_\_

2

**From:** "L. Scott Mann" <LScottMann@aol.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 12/27/97 1:20am  
**Subject:** pay phone fiasco

96-128

Sirs:

Only the Federal Government could make such a mess of a simple problem.

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Forcing those who have 800 numbers to pay \$.30 for calls from payphone is an asinine solution to a simple problem. First of all, there should be no charge at all. Payphone providers make plenty of money on coin and other toll calls. However, if you insist on making 800 calls generate ADDITIONAL revenue for the pay phone providers, why not simply charge the CALLER the same amount for those calls as you would a local call? Why devise such a complex solution to a simple problem?

Please reconsider this matter.

Regards,

L. Scott Mann  
owner of five 800 or 888 numbers

RECEIVED

DEC 29 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

2

**From:** Mike <mikenyb@ix.netcom.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 12/27/97 3:24pm  
**Subject:** Payphone Fee

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

I don't like the FCC mandated Pay phone fee that you have instituted. I think it is unfair and will unduly line the pockets of pay phone operators.

Don't you guys have better things to do that mess with things that are already working fine.

My phone company is also retroactively charging me this fee that I knew nothing about. Who is going to pay this \$8.40 charge I now have for 1 month? I know it won't be you.

Thanks for nothing,

Mike Nybank

RECEIVED

DEC 29 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List A B C D E \_\_\_\_\_

2

**From:** "L. Scott Mann" <LScottMann@aol.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 12/27/97 1:20am  
**Subject:** pay phone fiasco

96-128

Sirs:

Only the Federal Government could make such a mess of a simple problem.

Forcing those who have 800 numbers to pay \$.30 for calls from payphone is an asinine solution to a simple problem. First of all, there should be no charge at all. Payphone providers make plenty of money on coin and other toll calls. However, if you insist on making 800 calls generate ADDITIONAL revenue for the pay phone providers, why not simply charge the CALLER the same amount for those calls as you would a local call? Why devise such a complex solution to a simple problem?

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL DEC 29 1997

RECEIVED  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Please reconsider this matter.

Regards,

L. Scott Mann  
owner of five 800 or 888 numbers

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List A B C D E \_\_\_\_\_

2

From: "Zorach Spira" <zspira@sprynet.com>  
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
Date: 12/27/97 8:36pm  
Subject: .35 charge for "toll free" calls from payphones

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

I wish to bitterly complain about the .35 fee imposed to companies whose clients call them utilizing their 800 or 888 numbers. I just received my phone bill (I utilize an 800 number for access to that long distance company) and there was a total additional charge of over \$30 for my long distance calls from a payphone. What this ruling did was do away with toll free calls as companies are passing those charges on to us, the consumer, and we are now being charged for these calls.

I urge the FCC to discontinue this charge as like I said previously, there will be no such thing as toll free calls from payphones.  
zspira@sprynet.com

RECEIVED

DEC 29 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E

**From:** Shawn Davidson <swdavidson@worldnet.att.net>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 12/28/97 5:22am  
**Subject:** PSP toll-free compensation

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

Dear Sirs,

I wanted to voice my objection to the requirement that pay phone companies be compensated for 800/888 (toll free) calls.

I certainly understand that these calls occur on telephones, but they are simply a part of doing business in an area. If a PSP is not making enough money in an area, then they should remove their phones.

They are already required to provide 911 and TDD access free, and requiring the long distance carrier (which ultimately means ALL of us that have 800#'s) to pay them for the USE of their phone to originate the call (we are already paying for the call itself) is unfair and an unreasonable burden on smaller companies.

I am generally opposed to government regulation, but this seems to be an are that SCREAMS for the intervention of the FCC.

Sincerely,

Shawn Davidson  
303 23rd Street  
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

**RECEIVED**

DEC 29 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E

**From:** Chassnw455 <Chassnw455@aol.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 12/28/97 9:01am  
**Subject:** payphone 800 calling charge

i disagree with the decision to let payphone companies charge .30 per call-the reason is that if you buy a service and you pay the charges for the service the service should apply to all phones wheather it comes from private phones or pay phones you just gave the pay phone companies another .30 cents per call that someone has paid extra money so if some one calls that number they do not have to pay any charges i think you should reimberse the american public for your decision that you made in 1996.

Charles R. Sneatlum  
P.o. Box 552  
Marysville, Washington  
98270  
Chassnw455@aol.com

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

DEC 29 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List A B C D E \_\_\_\_\_

2



**From:** "J. Arthur Haddow" <moveusa@fia.net>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 12/28/97 12:28pm  
**Subject:** Pay phone 800 number surcharge

I am curious as to how the FCC intends to stop crooks from setting up a pay phone system with speed dialers that will call thousands of toll free numbers at random simply to collect the 29 cent surcharge. I am also concerned that there are many wrong numbers dialed that we toll free number holders will be charged. Why not make it where the user of the pay phone must pay the 30 cent fee to use the pay phone to dial the toll free number and let the pay phone carriers choose if they will charge for the service or will use competitive forces determine the charge and paid for by the user. My name is Art Haddow, and my company is Premier Van Lines in Salt Lake City, Utah. My e-mail is moveusa@fia.net. I would like a response.

96-128

**RECEIVED**

DEC 29 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List A B C D E \_\_\_\_\_

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** Steve Greif <STEVE.GREIF@jhuapl.edu>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 12/29/97 11:21am  
**Subject:** Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of 1996 Act

96-128

Charging 35 cents per use of a pay phone for calling 800 numbers to make credit card calls is an outrageous ripoff of the consumer for the benefit of the pay phone industry. I understand that perhaps there should be some small compensation for the use of this phone for non-local calls, but to charge 35 cents for each one is incredible. It turns what would otherwise be a 10 cent call into a 45 cent call, which completely changes the economics of the use of the phone. It would be far better to add a small percentage of the cost of the call, say 5% or 10%, and use that to compensate the industry, if that is deemed to be a desirable end.

**RECEIVED**

DEC 29 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E